1	JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CASBN 44332) United States Attorney		
3	BRIAN J. STRETCH (CASBN 163973) Chief, Criminal Division		
4 5	ROBERT N. MICHAELS (PABN 200918) Special Assistant United States Attorney		
6 7	Defense Language Institute – Criminal Law 1336 Plummer Street, Building 275 Monterey, CA 93944 Telephone: (831) 242-4537		
8 9	FAX: (831) 242-5198 Attorneys for Plaintiff		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
12	SALINAS DIVISION		
13	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	Criminal No.: CR-08-00126-HRL	
14	Plaintiff,	SECOND STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME	
15	vs.		
16	JOSEPH M. SANTILLAN,		
17	Defendant.		
18			
19	On June 2, 2008, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for a status hearing. The		
20	parties jointly requested that the case be continued from June 2, 2008, until August 4, 2008 at		
21	9:30 a.m., in order to allow time for defendant's counsel to prepare for the case. In addition, the		
22	parties requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act, from June 2, 2008 to August		
23	4, 2008 at 9:30 a.m. The parties agree and stipulate that an exclusion of time is appropriate		
24	based on the defendant's need for effective prep	aration of counsel.	
25			
26			
	SECOND STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER	I EXCLUDING TIME	

1		
2	SO STIPULATED:	JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO United States Attorney
3		
4	DATED: 5 June 2008	/S/ ROBERT N. MICHAELS
5		Special Assistant United States Attorney
6		
7	DATED:	/S/ NICK HUMY
8		NICK HUMY Counsel for SANTILLAN
9		
10		ORDER
11	Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded	
12	under the Speedy Trial Act from June 2, 2008 to August 4, 2008. The Court finds, based on the	
13	aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice are served by granting the requested continuance	
14	and outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The failure to	
15	grant the requested continuance would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for	
16	effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a	
17	miscarriage of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made	
18	under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).	
19	SO ORDERED.	
20		
21	DATED:	HOWARD R. LLOYD
22		United States Magistrate Judge
23		
24		
25		
26		
		2
	SECOND STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME	

CASE NO: CR-08-00126-HRL